

18452

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 11

It is reasonable to assume that the Republican candidate for the Presidency, under present circumstances, would want to debate his opponent. It is equally reasonable to believe that President Johnson's decision, assuming his candidacy, will be much more difficult. It has been said that President Johnson may suffer unfavorably in comparison with Mr. Kennedy's debate appearances in 1960. His advisers have been reported as urging him not to give his lesser-known opponent the opportunity to debate with him. There have been recollections of the belief prevalent in 1960 that Mr. Nixon lost the election when he consented to debate.

And yet, in 1960, many of Senator Kennedy's advisers had serious reservations about letting him debate with Vice President Nixon. The Vice President was known as a skilled debater and a forceful television personality. His famous "Checkers speech" in 1952 was supposed to have revealed him as a master of the medium. His experience in the administration, his knowledge of inside facts and his close relationship with President Eisenhower added to his prospects. At the time, it might very well have been said that John F. Kennedy was no match for Richard M. Nixon before the camera.

There is, in my opinion, no such thing as a "telegenic" political personality. It is a myth that television can alone make or break a candidate. Television cannot "create" a personality. It can only give the personality that exists a wider audience—in effect, enlarge the meeting place where he appears before the voters.

As a matter of fact, it was much easier in the days of the "front porch" campaign—when nobody but a trickle of party stalwarts saw the candidates except at a few carefully staged rallies—to create a political personality out of thin air. One has to go back no farther than the Harding campaign to suggest that many an inadequate candidate in the past could not have survived the scrutiny permitted the voter by television in 1960. Far from creating synthetic personalities, television can only unmask them.

Both the style and personality of President Johnson, as revealed on television, are different from those of President Kennedy. But the difference is not rooted in television; the two men are in fact different in their personalities and in their styles—off television as well as on.

President Kennedy was a man of distinctive character and characteristics—and they were clearly perceptible on television. So is President Johnson. Indeed, President Johnson seems to have captivated and strengthened the whole country and reassured the world by the warmth and earnestness of his television appearances immediately following his accession to the Presidency. These and other qualities are ones that he brings to the office and that are revealed on television—not what he brings to television and then adapts to the office.

The argument that it would be highly dangerous—or even imprudent, as President Eisenhower thought—for an incumbent President to debate in any forum does not seem to me persuasive. After all, the President has been televised live in news conferences and has been regularly questioned by as many as 200 correspondents on any subject they may wish to bring up. Surely, his opponent for the Presidency would be no less responsible and no less devoted to the national interest than the newsmen.

And surely any audience would recognize the need for restraint on the part of both candidates. As a matter of fact, Mr. Nixon was, in 1960, privy to the highest state secrets, and Mr. Kennedy respected his position.

As for the dangers of direct dialog between the two candidates, they may also be more imagined than real. In many other democ-

racies, heads of government periodically submit to questioning by the opposition as a part of the parliamentary system. This practice is considered a distinct advantage over ours by many political scientists, who envy, for instance, the opposition's power in England to question the Prime Minister on the floor of the House of Commons.

This system depends importantly on the opposition's maintaining the same high degree of responsibility in its questioning that we could certainly expect from a candidate running against an incumbent President. He would have little to gain—and everything to lose—by exceeding the bounds of propriety.

In the final analysis, the public should be the only touchstone to the decision of whether or not there should be debates. It may well be that, under some circumstances, more informal dialogs between candidates would be equally or even more helpful to the voters. It is not a question of what is in the best interests of the candidate. It is not a question of what is in the best interests of broadcasters or any other group. The one, the only, valid question is what is most helpful to the people in the first business of democracy—the free and informed choice of its leadership.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 534 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Allott
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender

Ervin
Gruening
Holland
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Morse
Mundt
Pearson
Proxmire

Robertson
Russell
Simpson
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—52

Aiken
Bartlett
Bayh
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper

Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney

Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saling
Saltan
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson
Cannon
Clark
Edmondson

Goldwater
Hruska
Kennedy
Long, La.

Morton
Pell
Walters

So Mr. MORSE's amendment (No. 1211) was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FREE IMPORTATION OF WILD ANIMALS AND WILD BIRDS—MEAT IMPORTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

PAYMENT OF SPECIAL PENSION TO CERTAIN HOLDERS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of